

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/767,607 01/22/2001 Kevin A. Owen 10002024-1 2528 7590 08/18/2004 EXAMINER HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY PHAM, THIERRY L Intellectual Property Administration PAPER NUMBER P.O. Box 272400 ART UNIT Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400 2624 DATE MAILED: 08/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<i>i</i>			
Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/767,607	OWEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thierry L Pham	2624	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA*  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica*  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) da*  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, I Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION.  CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ation. ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of thy period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC by statute, cause the application to become a	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communi ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	n .		
·	☐ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
•	inder Ex parte Quayle, 1955 C.	D. 11, 433 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the apple 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) 8 and 10 is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction	vithdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Example 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)  Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to n to the drawing(s) be held in abeyon correction is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority doc  2. Certified copies of the priority doc  3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International  * See the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in he priority documents have bee Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stag	e
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date	948) Paper No	r Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	,

Art Unit: 2624

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Duplicate Claims**

1. Applicant is advised that should claims 8 and 10 be found allowable, claims 8 and 10 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kageyama (U.S. 6333790).

Regarding claim 1, Kageyama discloses a hardcopy device (printer, fig. 2) comprising:

- (1) a processor (printer controller includes MPU, fig. 6);
- (2) an image printing unit (printer engine, fig. 6) which is controlled by said processor and fed by a print media supply and handling unit (inherently known in the art that all printers include print media handling and supplying unit); and
- (3) a memory unit (RAM memory, fig. 6) containing an electronic document file (information file describing printer's features and its usage, fig. 10) which is retrieved, on command (commands from host computer and/or via control panel, fig. 1 and fig. 6), from said memory by said processor and printed in hardcopy form by said image printing unit;

Art Unit: 2624

(4) wherein said electronic document file is a document describing features of said hardcopy device (information file describing printer's features and its usage, fig. 10, col. 5, lines 60-67 to col. 6, lines 1-18).

Regarding claim 2, Kageyama further discloses the device of claim 1, wherein said memory unit is a read-only memory unit (ROM memory, fig. 6) and contains said electronic document file.

Regarding claim 3, Kageyama further discloses the device of claim 1, further comprising a user interface unit (user operating control panel, fig. 6) with which a user can issue a command for said device to print said electronic document file in hardcopy form.

Regarding claim 4, Kageyama further discloses the device of claim 3, wherein said user interface unit displays (user operating control panel, fig. 6) a menu from which said command is issued in response to selection of a corresponding menu item.

Regarding claim 5, Kageyama further discloses the device of claim 3, further comprising a display associated with said device which advertises a specific manipulation (fig. 10) of said user interface device that will issue said command.

Regarding claim 6, Kageyama further discloses the device of claim 1, further comprising a connection to a host device (fig. 1), wherein said host device issues said command to print said electronic document file.

Regarding claim 7, Kageyama further discloses the device of claim 1, further comprising a connection to a host device, wherein an updated electronic document file (download information from the host, cols. 14-15) is downloaded from said host device to said hardcopy device.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claims 8 & 10, Kageyama further discloses the device of claim 1, farther comprising a static memory unit (fig. 6) in which said updated electronic document file is stored.

Regarding claim 11, Kageyama further discloses the device of claim 1, wherein said hardcopy device is a facsimile machine (col. 10, lines 58-67) further comprising a modem and connection to a phone line.

Regarding claim 12, Kageyama further discloses the device of claim 11, wherein said facsimile machine further comprises an update subroutine (updating, cols. 14-15) which causes said facsimile machine to connect via said phone line to a host system from which an updated electronic document file is downloaded.

Regarding claims 13-17, 19-20 recite limitations that are similar and in the same scope of invention as to those in claims 1-8, 10-12 and combination thereof, therefore, claims 13-17, 19-20 are rejected for the same rejection rationale/basis as described in claims 1-8, 10-12.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 9 & 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kageyama as described in claims 1 and/or 13 above, and in view of Lee (U.S. 6628413).

Regarding claims 9 & 18, Kageyama does not disclose wherein hardcopy device comprising an embedded Web Browser for downloading an updated electronic document file from the Internet or Web.

Art Unit: 2624

Lee, in the same field of endeavor for printer, teaches a hardcopy device comprising an embedded Web Browser (Java printer comprising a Web Brower for downloading/uploading updated parameters, col. 5, lines 8-65) for downloading an updated electronic document file from the Internet or Web.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Kageyama as per teachings of Lee because of a following reason: (1) to allow operators/users to connect to the WEB from the printer without having to use the host computer; therefore, reducing hardware costs.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kageyama with Lee to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9 & 18.

### Conclusion

- 6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- (1) U.S. 6501485 to Dash et al, teaches a multifunctional printer comprising a control panel interface for accessing features that are incorporated within the printer.
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thierry L Pham whose telephone number is (703) 305-1897. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K Moore can be reached on (703)308-7452. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thierry L. Pham

GABRIEL GARCIA PRIMARY EXAMINER